UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,053	06/18/2008	Graham Charles Bloomfield	PR/4-33330A	3708
	7590 08/09/201 STITUTES FOR BIO	EXAMINER		
220 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139			STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NIBR.MAILDATA@NOVARTIS.COM PATRICIA.HOFSTETTER@NOVARTIS.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/568,053	BLOOMFIELD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	AITOIIIL	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th	e cover sheet with the correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED August 2, 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1 application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 periods:) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ppeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of th	e final rejection			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than S	tion, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	If the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>02 August 2010</u>. A brief in comp date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	ion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideratio 				
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or 	or appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspon NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	ding number of finally rejected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See at 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	ttached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if non-allowable claim(s).	submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will no how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided belo The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>14 and 20</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21-23</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before o because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficien was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the st REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	atus of the claims after entry is below or attached.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/13. ☐ Other:	08) Paper No(s)			
Л	.aura L. Stockton/			
Р	rimary Examiner rt Unit: 1626			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's statement did not include the language "at the time this invention was made" or "was subject to a joint research agreement at the time this invention was made".

MPEP 706.02(I)(2), Part I. under "Definition of Common Ownership" states the following:

The requirement for common ownership at the time the claimed invention was made is intended to preclude obtaining ownership of subject matter after the claimed invention was made in order to disqualify that subject matter as prior art against the claimed invention.

The question of whether common ownership exists at the time the claimed invention was made is to be determined on the facts of the particular case in question. Actual ownership of the subject matter and the claimed invention by the same individual(s) or organization(s) or a legal obligation to assign both the subject matter and the claimed invention to the same individual(s) or organization(s)/business entity(ies) must be in existence at the time the claimed invention was made in order for the subject matter to be disqualified as prior art. A moral or unenforceable obligation would not evidence common ownership.

MPEP 706.02(I)(2), Part II. under "Evidence Required to Establish Common Ownership" (reproduced below), gives an example of a proper statement.

For example, an attorney or agent of record receives an Office action for Application X in which all the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) using Patent A in view of Patent B wherein Patent A is only available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f), and/or (g). In her response to the Office action, the attorney or agent of record for Application X states. in a clear and conspicuous manner, that:

"Application X and Patent A were, at the time the invention of Application X was made, owned by Company Z."

Therefore, WO 03/072557 has not been disqualified as prior art. Further, non-elected, and unexamined, inventions are found in withdrawn pending claims 21-23. See the paragraph in the middle of page 7 in the final Office Action dated April 2, 2010. Additionally, Applicant's attention is directed to the assignee (i.e., Novartis), the inventors and especially, the effective filing date and the claims in US 2010/0093690, published April 15, 2010 (the published date is after April 2, 2010, the date of the final rejection in the instant application).